UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,957	11/25/2003	Subramanyam Vdaygiri	2002P19339 US01	5907

7590   09/18/2008

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER
LIU, LIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 November 2003</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>11/25/2003</u> is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is responsive to communications filed on 11/25/2003.

Claims 1-42 are pending and have been examined.

Drawings

2.   The informal drawings are not of sufficient quality to permit examination.

Accordingly, replacement drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are

required in reply to this Office action. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled

"Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct

any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office

action.

The applicant is reminded that failure to timely submit replacement drawing

sheets in response to this Office action will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

Specification

3.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- page 1, line 26 of the specification recites "relay", the examiner believes it is a
  typo for "rely";

- page 11, line 2 of the specification recites "BURL", the examiner believes it is
  a typo for "URL".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims 1, 23, 26-30, 32-33 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

being anticipated by **Pizano et al (Patent no.: US 6,105,055).**

With respect to **claim 1,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration

between a plurality of users including a host of a collaboration event, comprising the

steps of:

storing an interface representative of said plurality of users in a memory location

commonly accessible to said users (Pizano: fig. 1, col. 2, lines 32-60);

creating a composite document from selected source materials (Pizano: abstract

and col. 2, lines 61-66);

selectively annotating said composite document (Pizano: col. 4, lines 17-26); and

personalizing said composite document with browser based annotations to form

a collaboration document (Pizano: col. 3, lines 2-27).

With respect to **claim 23,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration

between a plurality of users including a host of a collaboration event, comprising the

steps of:

storing an interface representative of said plurality of users in a memory location

commonly accessible to said users (Pizano: fig. 1, col. 2, lines 32-60);

creating a composite document from selected source materials (Pizano: abstract and col. 2, lines 61-66);

selectively annotating said composite document (Pizano: col. 4, lines 17-26);

personalizing said composite document with browser based annotations to form a collaboration document (Pizano: col. 3, lines 2-27);

storing said collaboration document in said memory location commonly accessible to said users (Pizano: fig. 1 & 4, col. 4, lines 17-54);

sharing retrieval address information for said collaboration document with said users (Pizano: col. 4, line 55 to col. 5, line 25);

making and locally storing further annotations to said collaboration document; and selectively sending at a desired time said further annotations to said collaboration document in said memory location commonly accessible to said users (Pizano: fig. 1 & 4, col. 4, lines 17-54).

With respect to **claim 26,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration between a first user and at least a second user, comprising the steps of:

said first user selecting a document page for said collaboration (Pizano: col. 4, lines 7-26);

said first user optionally associating user-entered data with said document page (Pizano: col. 4, lines 7-26);

said first user saving said document page together with said user-entered data associated therewith as a collaboration document in a memory location commonly accessible to said first and said second user (Pizano: col. 4, lines 27-54);

said first and second users establishing message communication for said

collaboration (Pizano: col. 4 line 17 to col. 5 line 25, noted that the first user creates

annotation comments and save them on the server, while the second user retrieves the

annotation from the server and replies by editing the annotation);

said second user retrieving said collaboration document, including said user-

entered data associated therewith (Pizano: col. 5, lines 15-35, noted retrieving of the

annotation data); and

said first and second users optionally modifying said user-entered data in the

context of said collaboration (Pizano: col. 5, lines 15-35, noted the user can post replies

to the annotation).

With respect to **claim 27,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration

as recited in claim 26, wherein said step of said first user selecting a document

comprises selecting a document from any of a server, a data repository, a shared portal,

disk storage, a database, and the Web (Pizano; fig. 1, col. 2, lines 32-60).

With respect to **claim 28,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration

as recited in claim 26, wherein said step of said first user optionally associating user-

entered data with said document page comprises a step of associating any of voice and

graphic annotations (Pizano: col. 2, line 61-66, col. 4, lines 17-26).

With respect to **claim 29,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration

as recited in claim 26, wherein said step of said first user optionally associating user-

entered data with said document page comprises a step of associating audio and

graphic annotations and a step of streaming said audio synchronously along with said

graphic annotations (Pizano: col. 4, lines 17-27 and col. 6, lines 17-28).

With respect to **claim 30,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration

as recited in claim 26, wherein said step of saving said document page comprises

saving said document page in a format requiring only a regular web browser to view

said annotated documents (Pizano: col. 5, lines 15-25).

With respect to **claim 32,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration

as recited in claim 26, wherein said step of creating a composite document comprises

creating said composite document in conformance with needs of said users and

applicable confidentiality and security requirements (Pizano: col. 3 line 34 to col. 4 line

6).

In regard to **claim 33** the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as

those in claim 1. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 1 is used to reject

claim 33. By this rationale **claim 33** is rejected.

In regard to **claim 35** the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as

those in claim 23. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 23 is used to reject

claim 35. By this rationale **claim 35** is rejected.

In regard to **claim 36** the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as

those in claim 23. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 23 is used to reject

claim 36. Furthermore, Pizano also teaches the limitations: "selecting a collaboration

mode for said collaboration event respecting said collaboration document, wherein said

collaboration mode comprises any of said offline, near real time, real time, and

disconnected modes" (Pizano: col. 3 line 29 to col. 4 line 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

> 1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
> 2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
> 3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
> 4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
>   obviousness or nonobviousness.

8.   Claims 2-16, 24-25 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Pizano et al (Patent no.: US 6,105,055)** in view of **Johnson et al.**

(PGPUB: US 2003/0023679 A1).

With respect to **claim 2,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration

as recited in claim 1, wherein said step of selectively annotating comprises a step

selectively adding synchronous voice annotations (Pizano: abstract).

However, Pizano does not explicitly teach a method of selectively annotating

comprises a step of selectively adding highlighting specific regions.

In the same field of endeavor, Johnson teaches a method of selectively annotating comprises a step of selectively adding highlighting specific regions (Johnson: fig. 6 & 8, and page 6, paragraphs 65 & 69, noted the highlighting tool).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of selectively adding highlighting specific regions as taught by Johnson in Pizano's invention in order to add more features to allow the conference administrator in expressing his/her ideas with regard to the content of the document.

With respect to **claim 3,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 2, wherein said step of selectively annotating comprises a step of adding any of dynamic and static annotations (Pizano: col. 2, lines 61-66).

Claims 4-5 list all the same elements of **claims 2 & 3**. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claims 2 & 3** applies equally as well to **claims 4-5.**

With respect to **claim 6,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 1, wherein said step of selectively annotating comprises a step of selectively adding a video file (Pizano: col. 4, lines 17-26).

With respect to **claim 7,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 1, wherein said step of selectively annotating comprises a step of selectively adding a video clip (Pizano: col. 4, lines 17-26).

With respect to **claim 8**, Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 7, wherein said step of adding a video clip comprises a step of selecting said video clip from a stored video file (Pizano: col. 4, lines 17-26).

With respect to **claim 9,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 8, wherein said step of adding a video clip comprises a step of adding hyperlinks to said video clip (Pizano: col. 4, lines 17-54).

With respect to **claim 10,** Pizano teaches all of the claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a method of selectively annotating comprises using browser based controls.

In the same field of endeavor, Johnson teaches a method of selectively annotating comprises using browser based controls (Johnson: abstract, page 5, paragraphs 61 & 63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of selectively annotating using browser based controls as taught by Johnson in Pizano's invention in order to effectively collaborate over long distances regardless of their location without the need to install extra software (Johnson: page 1, paragraph 9).

With respect to **claim 11,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 1, including the steps of:

storing said collaboration document in said memory location commonly accessible to said users (Pizano: fig. 1 & 4, col. 4, lines 17-54); and

sharing retrieval address information for said collaboration document with said users (Pizano: col. 4, line 55 to col. 5, line 25).

With respect to **claim 12,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 1, wherein said step of storing an interface comprises sending said interface to any of:

(a) a content management system of the type represented by Sharepoint, Interwoven, and the like,

(b) file systems on different servers (Pizano: fig. 4, col. 4, lines 27-54), and

(c) a local file system.

With respect to **claim 13** Pizano teaches all of the claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a method of sharing retrieval address information comprises sending retrieval address information by e-mail.

In the same field of endeavor, Johnson teaches a method of sharing retrieval address information comprises sending retrieval address information by e-mail. (Johnson: page 5, paragraph 63 and page 6, paragraph 71).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of sending retrieval address information by e-mail as taught by Johnson in Pizano's invention in order to implement a cost effective system and since the method of using e-mail for communication is very common and well known.

With respect to **claim 14,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 11, including a step of categorizing and storing said collaboration document (Pizano: col. 4, lines 27-54).

With respect to **claim 15,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 1, wherein said step of personalizing said composite document comprises using e-mail (Pizano: col. 4, lines 27-37).

With respect to **claim 16,** Pizano teaches a method or multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 15, wherein said step of personalizing comprises utilizing rich multimedia messaging by way of e-mail (Pizano: col. 4, lines 27-37).

In regard to **claim 24** the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 2. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 2 is used to reject claim 24. By this rationale **claim 24** is rejected.

In regard to **claim 25** the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 10. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 10 is used to reject claim 25. By this rationale **claim 25** is rejected.

With respect to **claim 31,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 26, wherein said step of saving said document page comprises saving said document page with a URL (Universal Resource Locator) in an Internet information server (Pizano: col. 4, lines 27-37).

However, Pizano does not explicitly teach a method of establishing message communication comprises said first user communicating said URL to said second user.

In the same field of endeavor, Johnson teaches a method of establishing message communication comprises said first user communicating said URL to said second user (Johnson: page 5, paragraph 63 and page 6, paragraph 71). Same motivation used in claim 13 applies equally as well to claim 31.

9.   Claims 17-22 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Pizano et al. (Patent no.: US 6,105,055)** in view of **Ludwig et al. (Patent no.: US 6,437,818 B1).**

With respect to **claim 17,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration between a plurality of users of a collaboration event, comprising the steps of:

storing an interface representative of said plurality of users in a memory location commonly accessible to said users (Pizano: fig. 1, col. 2, lines 32-60);

creating a composite document from selected source materials (Pizano: abstract and col. 2, lines 61-66);

selectively annotating said composite document (Pizano: col. 4, lines 17-26);

personalizing said composite document with browser based annotations to form a collaboration document (Pizano: col. 3, lines 2-27);

storing said collaboration document in said memory location commonly accessible to said users (Pizano: fig. 1 & 4, col. 4, lines 17-54);

establishing message communication amongst said plurality of users (Pizano: col. 3 line 29 to col. 4 line 6);

selectively making and locally storing further annotations to said collaboration document (Pizano: col. 4, lines 17-38);

selectively sending at a desired time said further annotations to said collaboration document in said memory location commonly accessible to said users (Pizano: col. 4, lines 27-54); and

wherein the foregoing steps are also selectively performed in an ongoing manner during said message communication (Pizano: col. 5, lines 15-55).

However, Pizano does not explicitly teach a method of establishing an instant conferencing communication amongst plurality of users.

In the same field of endeavor, Ludwig teaches a method of establishing an instant conferencing communication amongst plurality of users (Ludwig: fig. 1-2, col. 6, lines 7-41, noted the collaborative multimedia workstation).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to integrate the collaborative multimedia workstation as taught by Ludwig in Pizano's invention in order to greatly facitilitate distributed collaboration, in part by replicating the benefits of face-to-face collaboration (Ludwig: col. 3, lines 2-7).

With respect to **claim 18,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 17, wherein said step of selectively annotating is repeatedly performed by any of said users and results thereof are overlaid and stored (Pizano: col. 5, lines 15-46).

With respect to **claim 19,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 17, wherein said step of selectively annotating includes selectively annotating with any of animation, graphics, voice, and video (Pizano: col. 4, lines 17-26).

With respect to **claim 20,** Pizano teaches all of the claimed limitations except that he does not explicitly teach a method of establishing instant conferencing includes establishing voice conferencing.

In the same field of endeavor, Ludwig teaches a method of establishing instant conferencing includes establishing voice conferencing (Ludwig: fig. 1-2, col. 6, lines 7-41). Same motivation used in claim 17 applies equally as well to claim 20.

With respect to **claim 21,** Pizano teaches all of the claimed limitations except that he does not explicitly teach a method of establishing instant conferencing includes establishing video conferencing.

In the same field of endeavor, Ludwig teaches a method of establishing instant conferencing includes establishing video conferencing (Ludwig: fig. 1-2, col. 6, lines 7-41). Same motivation used in claim 17 applies equally as well to claim 21.

With respect to **claim 22,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 17, wherein said step of creating a composite document comprises creating said composite document in conformance with needs of said users and applicable confidentiality and security requirements (Pizano: col. 3 line 34 to col. 4 line 6).

In regard to **claim 34** the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 17. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 17 is used to reject claim 34. By this rationale **claim 34** is rejected.

10.   Claims 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Pizano et al (Patent no.: US 6,105,055)** in view of **Eintracht et al. (Patent no.: US 6,687,878 B1).**

With respect to **claim 37,** Pizano teaches all of the claimed limitations except that he does not explicitly teach a method of generating and storing a log of collaboration.

In the same field of endeavor, Eintracht teaches a method of generating and storing a log of collaboration (Eintracht: col. 2 lines 25-28, and col. 3, lines 37-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of generating and storing a log of collaboration as taught by Eintracht in Pizano's invention in order to keep a transaction history of all event for notes (Eintracht: col. 3 line 37-44).

With respect to **claim 38,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 36, wherein said step of selecting a collaboration mode comprises selecting a single one of said offline, near real time, real time, and disconnected modes (Pizano: col. 3 line 29 to col. 4 line 6).

With respect to **claim 39,** Pizano teaches a method for multimedia collaboration as recited in claim 36, wherein said step of selecting a collaboration mode comprises selecting a plurality of said offline, near real time, real time, and disconnected modes (Pizano: col. 3 line 29 to col. 4 line 6).

In regard to **claims 40-42** the limitations of these claims are substantially the same as those in claims 37-39. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claims 37-39 is used to reject claims 40-42. By this rationale **claims 40-42** are rejected.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

- Krautter (Patent no.: US 6,766,356 B1) discloses a method for remotely

    modifying presentations in a multimedia conference.

- Pacifici et al. (Patent no.: US 6,230,171 B1) discloses markup system for shared

    HTML documents.

- Kasriel (PGPUB: US 2003/0204490 A1) discloses a web-page collaboration

    system to allow virtual appending of comments.

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Lin Liu whose telephone number is (571) 270-1447.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. L./   /Andrew Caldwell/
                                                               Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
                                                               Unit 2145

/Lin Liu/
Examiner, Art Unit 2145